arXiv:math/0510606v1 [math.AP] 27 Oct 2005

On the best Hölder exponent for two dimensional elliptic equations in divergence form

Tonia Ricciardi*
Dipartimento di Matematica e Applicazioni "R. Caccioppoli"
Università di Napoli Federico II
Via Cintia, 80126 Naples, Italy
fax: +39 081 675665
`tonia.ricciardi@unina.it`

Abstract

We obtain an estimate for the Hölder continuity exponent for weak solutions to the following elliptic equation in divergence form:

$$\operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla u) = 0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega,$$

where Ω is a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}^2$ and, for every $x \in \Omega$, $A(x)$ is a matrix with bounded measurable coefficients. Such an estimate "interpolates" between the well-known estimate of Piccinini and Spagnolo in the isotropic case $A(x) = a(x)I$, where a is a bounded measurable function, and our previous result in the unit determinant case $\det A(x) \equiv 1$. Furthermore, we show that our estimate is sharp. Indeed, for every $\tau \in [0, 1]$ we construct coefficient matrices A_τ such that A_0 is isotropic and A_1 has unit determinant, and such that our estimate for A_τ reduces to an equality, for every $\tau \in [0, 1]$.

Key Words: linear elliptic equation, measurable coefficients, Hölder regularity

MSC 2000 Subject Classification: 35J60

1 Introduction and main results

Let Ω be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}^2$ and let $u \in H^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ be a weak solution to the elliptic, divergence-form equation with measurable coefficients:

$$\operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla u) = 0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{1}$$

where $A(x)$, $x \in \Omega$, is a 2×2 matrix satisfying the uniform ellipticity condition

$$\lambda|\xi|^2 \le \langle \xi, A(x)\xi \rangle \le \Lambda|\xi|^2, \tag{2}$$

---

[*] Supported in part by the MIUR National Project *Variational Methods and Nonlinear Differential Equations*.

for every $x \in \Omega$, for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and for some constants $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda$. By classical results of De Giorgi [1] and Nash [5], it is well-known that u is locally Hölder continuous in Ω. Namely, there exists a constant $\alpha \in (0,1)$ such that for every $K \Subset \Omega$ there exists $C(K) > 0$ such that:

$$\frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x-y|^\alpha} \leq C(K) \qquad \forall x, y \in K. \tag{3}$$

The sharp estimate of α in terms of the ellipticity constant $L = \Lambda/\lambda$ was obtained by Piccinini and Spagnolo [6], who showed that $\alpha \geq L^{-1/2}$. Under additional assumptions on A, this estimate may be improved. For example, if A is isotropic, namely if $A(x) = a(x)I$ for some measurable function a satisfying $1 \leq a \leq L$, it was shown by Piccinini and Spagnolo [6] that

$$\alpha \geq \frac{4}{\pi} \arctan L^{-1/2}. \tag{4}$$

On the other hand, we showed in [7] that if A has unit determinant, namely if $\det A(x) = 1$ for all $x \in \Omega$, then

$$\alpha \geq \left(\sup_{S_\rho(x) \subset \Omega} \int_{S_\rho(x)} \langle n, A\,n \rangle \right)^{-1}, \tag{5}$$

where $S_\rho(x)$ is the circle of radius ρ centered at x and n is the outward unit normal. See Iwaniec and Sbordone [3] for the relevance of the unit determinant case in the context of quasiconformal mappings. Our aim in this note is to obtain an estimate for α in the case of general coefficient matrices A satisfying the ellipticity condition (2), which "unifies" the estimates (4)–(5). We shall obtain a formula which, despite of its complicated form, is indeed attained on a family of coefficient matrices A_τ, $\tau \in [0,1]$, such that A_0 is isotropic and A_1 has unit determinant. In fact, our main effort in this note is to construct A_τ. More precisely, for every A satisfying (1), let

$$\alpha(A) = \sup \left\{ \alpha \in (0,1) \ : \ \begin{array}{c} \text{property (3) holds for every} \\ \text{solution } u \in H^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega) \text{ to (1)} \end{array} \right\}.$$

We prove the following results.

Theorem 1 (Estimate). *Suppose A satisfies (2). Then, $\alpha(A) \geq \beta(A)$, where*

$$\beta(A) = \left(\sup_{S_\rho(x) \subset \Omega} \frac{\frac{1}{|S_\rho(x)|} \int_{S_\rho(x)} \frac{\langle n, A\,n \rangle}{\sqrt{\det A}}}{\frac{4}{\pi} \arctan \left(\frac{\inf_{S_\rho(x)} \det A}{\sup_{S_\rho(x)} \det A} \right)^{1/4}} \right)^{-1}. \tag{6}$$

As already mentioned, Theorem 1 is sharp, in the following sense.

Theorem 2 (Sharpness). *For every $\tau \in [0,1]$ and for every $x \neq 0$, let $A_\tau = JK_\tau J^*$, where*

$$K(x) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^2}, & \text{if } \arg x \in [0, \frac{\pi}{1+M^{-\tau}}) \cup [\pi, \pi + \frac{\pi}{1+M^{-\tau}}) \\ \mathrm{diag}(M, M^{1-2\tau}), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

for some $M > 1$ *and*

$$J(\arg x) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\arg x) & -\sin(\arg x) \\ \sin(\arg x) & \cos(\arg x) \end{pmatrix}.$$

There exists $m_0 > 1$ *such that the equality*

$$\alpha(A_\tau) = \beta(A_\tau)$$

holds for all $M \in (1, m_0^{1/\tau})$ *if* $\tau > 0$, *and with no restriction on* M *if* $\tau = 0$.

Notation Throughout this note, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and for all $\rho > 0$, $B_\rho(x)$ denotes the ball of radius ρ centered at x and $S_\rho(x) = \partial B_\rho(x)$. For every curve γ we denote by $|\gamma|$ the length of γ. For every measurable function f we denote by $\inf f$ and $\sup f$ the essential lower bound and the essential upper bound of f, respectively.

2 Proof of Theorem 1

The proof of Theorem 1 relies on an argument of Piccinini and Spagnolo [6], together with a weighted Wirtinger inequality obtained in [8]. Let

$$\mathcal{B} = \{a \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \ : \ a \text{ is } 2\pi\text{−periodic and } \inf a > 0\}$$

and for every $L > 1$, let Let $C(a, b) > 0$ denote the best constant in the following weighted Wirtinger type inequality:

$$\int_0^{2\pi} a\, w^2 \le C(a,b) \int_0^{2\pi} b w'^2, \tag{7}$$

where $w \in H^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ is 2π-periodic and satisfies the constraint

$$\int_0^{2\pi} aw = 0, \tag{8}$$

and $a, b \in \mathcal{B}$.

Lemma 1 ([8]). *Suppose* $a, b \in \mathcal{B}$. *Then,*

$$C(a,b) \le \left(\frac{\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \sqrt{ab^{-1}}}{\frac{4}{\pi}\arctan\left(\frac{\inf ab}{\sup ab}\right)^{1/4}} \right)^2. \tag{9}$$

We note that Lemma 1 reduces to the sharp Wirtinger inequality of Piccinini and Spagnolo [6] when $a = b$. Estimate (9) has been recently extended in [2] to the case $a, b^{-1}, \sqrt{ab^{-1}} \in L^1$ and $0 < \inf(ab) \le \sup(ab) < +\infty$.

In order to proceed, for every fixed $x \in \Omega$ and for every $\rho \in (0, d_x)$, we denote by $y = x + \rho e^{it}$ the polar coordinate transformation centered at x. We denote

$$\overline{\nabla} u = \left(u_\rho, \frac{u_t}{\rho} \right)$$

and for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ we denote

$$J(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos t & -\sin t \\ \sin t & \cos t \end{pmatrix}. \tag{10}$$

Then,

$$\nabla u = J(\theta)\overline{\nabla} u. \tag{11}$$

Lemma 2. *For every matrix A satisfying (2), and for every $x \in \Omega$, $0 < \rho < d_x$, let*

$$C_A(x,\rho) = C\left(\langle e^{it}, A(x+\rho e^{it})e^{it}\rangle, \frac{\det A(x+\rho e^{it})}{\langle e^{it}, A(x+\rho e^{it})e^{it}\rangle}\right)$$

denote the best constant in (7)–(8) with

$$a(t) = \langle e^{it}, A(x+\rho e^{it})e^{it}\rangle, \qquad b(t) = \frac{\det A(x+\rho e^{it})}{\langle e^{it}, A(x+\rho e^{it})e^{it}\rangle}.$$

Then, $\alpha(A) \geq \beta_0(A)$, where

$$\beta_0(A) = \left(\sup_{x\in\Omega, 0<\rho<d_x} C_A(x,\rho)^{1/2}\right)^{-1}.$$

Proof. We show that for every $u \in H^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ solution to (1) there holds:

$$\sup_{0<\rho<d_x} \rho^{-2\beta_0(A)} \int_{B_\rho(x)} \langle \nabla u, A\nabla u\rangle < +\infty, \tag{12}$$

for every $x \in \Omega$. Once estimate (12) is established, the statement follows by the well-known regularity results of Morrey [4]. In order to derive (12), we exploit some ideas in [6]. For every $x \in \Omega$ and for every $0 < \rho < d_x$, we set

$$g_x(\rho) = \int_{B_\rho(x)} \langle \nabla u, A\nabla u\rangle.$$

We denote by $P = (p_{ij})$ the matrix defined by

$$P(x+\rho e^{it}) = J^*(t)A(x+\rho e^{it})J(t).$$

Note that $p_{11}(x+\rho e^{it}) = \langle e^{it}, A(x+\rho e^{it})e^{it}\rangle$ and $\det P = \det A$. By the divergence theorem and (1), we have

$$g_x(\rho) = \int_{S_\rho(x)} (u-\mu)\langle n, A\nabla u\rangle = \int_{S_\rho(x)} (u-\mu)\langle \underline{e}_1, P\overline{\nabla} u\rangle,$$

where n is the outward normal to $S_\rho(x)$, $\underline{e}_1 = (1,0)$ and μ is any constant. In view of Hölder's inequality, we may write

$$g_x(\rho) \leq \left(\int_{S_\rho(x)} p_{11}(u-\mu)^2\right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{S_\rho(x)} \frac{\langle \underline{e}_1, P\overline{\nabla} u\rangle^2}{p_{11}}\right)^{1/2}.$$

By inequality (7) with $a(t) = p_{11}(x + \rho e^{it})$, $b(t) = \det A/p_{11}(x + \rho e^{it})$ and

$$w(t) = u(x + \rho e^{it}) - \mu, \qquad \mu = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} p_{11}(x + \rho e^{it}) u(x + \rho e^{it})\,\mathrm{d}\theta,$$

we derive

$$\int_{S_\rho(x)} p_{11}(u - \mu)^2 \le C_A(x, \rho) \int_{S_\rho(x)} \frac{\det A}{p_{11}} u_t^2.$$

Therefore,

$$g_x(\rho) \le C_A^{1/2}(x, \rho) \left(\int_{S_\rho(x)} \frac{\det A}{p_{11}} u_t^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{S_\rho(x)} \frac{\langle \underline{e}_1, P\overline{\nabla} u\rangle^2}{p_{11}} \right)^{1/2}.$$

At this point, we observe that any 2×2 symmetric matrix $B = (b_{ij})$ such that $b_{11} \neq 0$ satisfies the following identity:

$$\langle \xi, B\xi \rangle = \frac{\langle \xi, Be_1\rangle^2}{b_{11}} + \frac{\det B}{b_{11}} \langle \xi, e_2 \rangle^2, \tag{13}$$

for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Recalling that $u_\theta/\rho = (\overline{\nabla} u)_{22}$, in view of the elementary inequality $\sqrt{ab} \le (a + b)/2$ and of identity (13) with $B = P(x + \rho e^{i\theta})$ and $\xi = \overline{\nabla} u$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
g_x(\rho) \le& \rho\, C_A^{1/2}(x, \rho) \left(\int_{S_\rho(x)} \frac{\det A}{p_{11}} \left(\frac{u_t}{\rho}\right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{S_\rho(x)} \frac{\langle e_1, P\overline{\nabla} u\rangle^2}{p_{11}} \right)^{1/2} \\
=& \rho\, C_A^{1/2}(x, \rho) \left(\int_{S_\rho(x)} \frac{\det A}{p_{11}} (\overline{\nabla} u)_{22}^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{S_\rho(x)} \frac{\langle e_1, P\overline{\nabla} u\rangle^2}{p_{11}} \right)^{1/2} \\
\le& \frac{\rho}{2} C_A^{1/2}(x, \rho) \int_{S_\rho(x)} \left(\frac{\det A}{p_{11}} (\overline{\nabla} u)_{22}^2 + \frac{\langle e_1, P\overline{\nabla} u\rangle^2}{p_{11}} \right) \\
=& \frac{\rho}{2} C_A^{1/2}(x, \rho) \int_{S_\rho(x)} \langle \overline{\nabla} u, P\overline{\nabla} u\rangle = \frac{\rho\, C_A^{1/2}(x, \rho)}{2} \int_{S_\rho(x)} \langle \nabla u, A\nabla u\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling the definition of g_x, we derive from the above inequality that:

$$g_x(\rho) \le \frac{\rho}{2} C_A^{1/2}(x, \rho)\, g_x'(\rho),$$

for almost every $0 < \rho < d_x$. In particular, for every $\rho \in (0, d_x)$ we have:

$$g_x(\rho) \le \frac{\rho}{2} \sup_{x \in \Omega, 0 < \rho < d_x} C_A^{1/2}(x, \rho)\, g_x'(\rho) = \frac{\rho}{2\beta_0(A)}\, g_x'(\rho) \qquad \text{in } (0, d_x).$$

The above implies that the function $\rho^{-2\beta_0(A)} g_x(\rho)$ in non-decreasing, and therefore bounded, in $(0, d_x)$. □

Proof of Theorem 1. In view of Lemma 1–(i) with

$$a(t) = p_{11}(x + \rho e^{it}), \qquad b(t) = \frac{\det A}{p_{11}}(x + \rho e^{it}),$$

we have

$$C_A(x,\rho) \le \left(\frac{\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \frac{p_{11}}{\sqrt{\det A}}(x+\rho e^{it})\,\mathrm{d}t}{\frac{4}{\pi}\arctan\left(\frac{\inf_{t\in(0,2\pi)}\det A(x+\rho e^{it})}{\sup_{t\in(0,2\pi)}\det A(x+\rho e^{it})}\right)^{1/4}} \right)^2 .$$

Now the asserted estimate follows by Lemma 2. The sharpness will follow by Proposition 1 in the next section. □

3 Proof of Theorem 2

We define

$$\mu = \frac{4}{\pi}\arctan M^{-(1-\tau)/2}, \qquad c = \frac{2}{1+M^{-\tau}}.$$

We prove

Proposition 1. *For every $\tau \in [0,1]$, let A_τ be the coefficient matrix defined in Theorem 2. There exists $m_0 > 1$ such that there holds*

$$\beta(A_\tau) = \frac{\mu}{c} = \frac{2}{\pi}(1+M^{-\tau})\arctan M^{-(1-\tau)/2}$$

for all $M \in (1, m_0^{1/\tau})$ if $\tau > 0$, and with no restriction on M if $\tau = 0$. Furthermore, let $u_\tau \in H^1(B)$ be defined in polar coordinates by

$$u_\tau(\rho,\theta) = \rho^{\mu/c} w_\tau(\theta),$$

where

$$w_\tau(\theta) = \begin{cases} \sin[\mu(c^{-1}\theta - \pi/4)], & \text{if } \theta \in [0, c\pi/2) \\ M^{-(1-\tau)/2}\cos[\mu\left(c^{-1}M^\tau(\theta - c\pi/2) - \pi/4\right)], & \text{if } \theta \in [c\pi/2, \pi) \end{cases}$$

and $w_\tau(\pi+\theta) = -w_\tau(\theta)$ for all $\theta \in [0,\pi)$. Then, u_τ is a weak solution to the elliptic equation (1) with $A = A_\tau$, and its Hölder exponent is μ/c. In particular, $\alpha(A_\tau) = \beta(A_\tau)$.

In order to prove Proposition 1, we begin by proving some lemmas.

Lemma 3. *For every $x \neq 0$ let $\theta = \arg x$ and let*

$$A(x) = A(\theta) = J(\theta)K(\theta)J^*(\theta),$$

where

$$K(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} k_1(\theta) & 0 \\ 0 & k_2(\theta) \end{pmatrix}$$

for some positive and bounded, 2π-periodic functions k_1, k_2. Then, in polar coordinates, equation (1) takes the form:

$$\begin{cases} (\rho k_1 u_\rho)_\rho + \left(\frac{k_2}{\rho}u_\theta\right)_\theta = 0 & \text{in } (0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R} \\ u \ 2\pi\text{-periodic in } \theta \end{cases} . \tag{14}$$

If $u \not\equiv 0$ is of the separation of variables form $u(\rho,\theta) = R(\rho)\Theta(\theta)$, then u satisfies (14) if and only if $R(\rho) = \rho^\gamma$ for some constant $\gamma > 0$ and Θ is a 2π-periodic weak solution to the equation:

$$-(k_2\Theta')' = \gamma^2 k_1 \Theta \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}. \tag{15}$$

Proof. By definition, u satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \langle \nabla u, A\nabla v\rangle = 0 \qquad \forall v \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2).$$

In polar coordinates centered at 0, recalling that $\overline{\nabla} u = (u_\rho, u_\theta/\rho)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \int_B \langle \nabla u, A\nabla v\rangle &= \int_{(0,+\infty)\times(0,2\pi)} \langle \overline{\nabla} u, K(\theta)\overline{\nabla} v\rangle \rho \,\mathrm{d}\rho\,\mathrm{d}\theta \\ &= \int_{(0,+\infty)\times(0,2\pi)} \left(\rho k_1 u_\rho v_\rho + \frac{k_2}{\rho} u_\theta v_\theta\right) \mathrm{d}\rho\,\mathrm{d}\theta, \end{aligned}$$

for every $v \in C_c^\infty(B)$. Integration by parts yields (14). Now suppose that $u(\rho,\theta) = R(\rho)\Theta(\theta)$. In view of Nikodym's theorem, R and Θ are absolutely continuous on $(0,+\infty)$ and $\mathbb{R}$, respectively. Choosing v of the form $v(\rho,\theta) = \varphi(\rho)\psi(\theta)$ with $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(0,+\infty)$ and $\psi \in C_c^\infty(0,2\pi)$, we derive from the above that

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \rho R'\varphi'\,\mathrm{d}\rho \int_0^{2\pi} k_1\Theta\psi\,\mathrm{d}\theta + \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{R}{\rho}\varphi\,\mathrm{d}\rho \int_0^{2\pi} k_2\Theta'\psi'\,\mathrm{d}\theta = 0.$$

Since φ, ψ are arbitrary, we conclude that

$$\frac{\int_0^{+\infty} (\rho R')'\varphi\,\mathrm{d}\rho}{\int_0^{+\infty} R\rho^{-1}\varphi\,\mathrm{d}\rho} = -\frac{\int_0^{2\pi} (k_2\Theta')'\psi\,\mathrm{d}\theta}{\int_0^{2\pi} k_1\Theta\psi\,\mathrm{d}\theta} = \tau,$$

for some constant $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows that

$$\int_0^{+\infty} (\rho R')'\varphi\,\mathrm{d}\rho = \tau \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{R}{\rho}\varphi\,\mathrm{d}\rho \qquad \forall \varphi \in C_c^\infty(0,+\infty)$$

and

$$\int_0^{2\pi} (k_2\Theta')'\psi\,\mathrm{d}\theta = -\tau \int_0^{2\pi} k_1\Theta\psi\,\mathrm{d}\theta \qquad \forall \psi \in C_c^\infty(0,2\pi),$$

and therefore (15) is established. By regularity, R is smooth in $(0,+\infty)$, it satisfies $(\rho R')' = \tau R\rho^{-1}$ in $(0,+\infty)$ and is bounded at the origin. Therefore, $R(\rho) = \rho^\gamma$ with $\gamma^2 = \tau > 0$. □

Lemma 4. *Suppose A satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 3. Then, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $\rho > 0$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $x + \rho e^{it} \neq 0$, we have*

(16)
$$\frac{\langle e^{it}, A(x+\rho e^{it})e^{it}\rangle}{\sqrt{\det A(x+\rho e^{it})}} = \sqrt{\frac{k_1(\theta(t))}{k_2(\theta(t))}} \cos^2\left(\theta(t) - t\right) + \sqrt{\frac{k_2(\theta(t))}{k_1(\theta(t))}} \sin^2\left(\theta(t) - t\right),$$

where

$$\theta(t) = \arg(x + \rho e^{it}).$$

Proof. Using the fact that $J^*(\theta)e^{it} = e^{i(t-\theta)}$ for all $t, \theta \in \mathbb{R}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e^{it}, A(x+\rho e^{it})e^{it}\rangle =& \langle J^*(\theta(t))e^{it}, K(\theta(t))J^*(\theta(t))e^{it}\rangle \\ =& k_1(\theta(t))\cos^2(t-\theta(t)) + k_2(\theta(t))\sin^2(t-\theta(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Now (16) follows easily. □

We shall need the following property from Euclidean geometry. As we have not found a proof in the literature, we include one here.

Lemma 5. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a (two-sided) cone with vertex at the origin and let $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ be such that $|x| < 1$. Then*

$$|\mathcal{C} \cap S_1(x)| = |\mathcal{C} \cap S_1(0)|. \tag{17}$$

Proof. We denote by A, B, C, D the intersection points of $\mathcal{C}$ with $S_1(x)$ taken in, say, counterclockwise order. We have to show that $\angle AxB + \angle CxD = \angle AOB + \angle COD = 2\angle AOB$. We set $\alpha = \angle AxB$, $\beta = \angle CxD$, $\varepsilon = \angle xAC = \angle xCA$, $\delta = \angle xBD = \angle xDB$, $\eta = \angle ABx = \angle BAx$, $\theta = \angle xCD = \angle xDC$, $\varphi = \angle AOB = \angle COD$. Then, summing the angles of the triangles AxB, CxD, AOB, COD, respectively, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha + 2\eta = \pi, &&\eta + \delta + \eta - \varepsilon + \varphi = \pi \\ &\beta + 2\theta = \pi, &&\theta + \varepsilon + \theta - \delta + \varphi = \pi. \end{aligned}$$

Summation of these equations yields $\alpha + \beta = 2\pi - 2(\eta + \theta)$ and $2(\eta + \theta) = 2\pi - 2\varphi$, from which we derive the desired equality $\alpha + \beta = 2\varphi$. □

For every $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and for every $\rho > 0$ we define

$$f(x, \rho) = \frac{1}{|S_\rho(x)|} \int_{S_\rho(x)} \frac{\langle n, A_\tau\, n\rangle}{\sqrt{\det A_\tau}} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\langle e^{it}, A_\tau(x + \rho e^{it}) e^{it}\rangle}{\sqrt{\det A_\tau(x + \rho e^{it})}}\, \mathrm{d}t,$$

where A_τ is the matrix defined in Theorem 2. We note that

$$f(x, \rho) = f\left(\frac{x}{\rho}, 1\right). \tag{18}$$

We prove the following.

Lemma 6. *There exists $m_0 > 1$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and for all $\rho > 0$ there holds*

$$f(x, \rho) \le f(0, 1) = c = \frac{2}{1 + M^{-\tau}},$$

for all $M \in (1, m_0^{1/\tau})$ if $\tau > 0$, and with no restriction on M if $\tau = 0$.

Proof. Throughout this proof, we let

$$m := M^\tau$$

and

$$\mathcal{C} := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\} : \ \arg x \in [\frac{\pi}{2}c, \pi) \cup [\pi + \frac{\pi}{2}c, 2\pi) \right\}.$$

Then

$$K_\tau(x) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{diag}(M, M^{1-2\tau}), & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{C} \\ \mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^2}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

In view of Lemma 4, it follows that

$$\frac{\langle e^{it}, A_\tau(x + \rho e^{it}) e^{it}\rangle}{\sqrt{\det A_\tau(x + \rho e^{it})}} = \\ = \begin{cases} m \cos^2\left(\theta(t) - t\right) + m^{-1} \sin^2\left(\theta(t) - t\right), & \text{if } x + \rho e^{it} \in \mathcal{C} \\ 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and in view of (18), we may assume $\rho = 1$.

Case (i): $|x| < 1$. We estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}
2\pi f(x,1) =& 2\pi - |\mathcal{C} \cap S_1(x)| \\
&+ \int_{\mathcal{C} \cap S_1(x)} \left\{ m \cos^2 (\theta(t) - t) + \frac{1}{m} \sin^2 (\theta(t) - t) \right\} \mathrm{d}t \\
=& 2\pi - |\mathcal{C} \cap S_1(x)| + \int_{\mathcal{C} \cap S_1(x)} \left\{ \left(m - \frac{1}{m} \right) \cos^2 (\theta(t) - t) + \frac{1}{m} \right\} \mathrm{d}t \\
\leq& 2\pi - |\mathcal{C} \cap S_1(x)| + m|\mathcal{C} \cap S_1(x)| = 2\pi + (m-1)|\mathcal{C} \cap S_1(x)|.
\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 5 we derive $|\mathcal{C} \cap S_1(x)| = |\mathcal{C} \cap S_1(0)|$ and therefore we obtain the estimate

$$2\pi f(x,1) \leq 2\pi + (m-1)|\mathcal{C} \cap S_1(0)|.$$

On the other hand, when $x = 0$ we have $\theta(t) - t \equiv 0$, and consequently

$$\frac{\langle e^{it}, A_\tau(e^{it}) e^{it} \rangle}{\sqrt{\det A_\tau(e^{it})}} = \begin{cases} m, & \text{if } e^{it} \in \mathcal{C} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

It follows that $2\pi f(0,1) = 2\pi + (m-1)|\mathcal{C} \cap S_1(0)|$, and recalling the definition of $\mathcal{C}$ and c, we obtain $f(0,1) = c = 2/(1+m^{-1})$. Hence, the desired estimate $f(x,1) \leq f(0,1)$ follows in the case $|x| < 1$ with no restriction on M.

Case (ii): $|x| \geq 1$. We set $h(t) = \cos^2(\theta(t) - t)$. By elementary geometrical arguments, for every $0 \leq k \leq 1$ we have

$$|\{h(t) \leq k\}| = 4 \arcsin \sqrt{k}. \tag{19}$$

Since $mh(t) + m^{-1}(1 - h(t)) \geq 1$ if and only if $h(t) \geq (m+1)^{-1}$, we estimate

$$2\pi f(x,1) \leq \left| \left\{ h(t) \leq \frac{1}{m+1} \right\} \right| + \int_{\{h(t) \geq (m+1)^{-1}\}} \left\{ mh(t) + \frac{1}{m}(1 - h(t)) \right\} \mathrm{d}t.$$

By virtue of (19), we derive

$$2\pi f(x,1) \leq 4 \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{1}{m+1}} + \int_{\{h(t) \geq (m+1)^{-1}\}} \left\{ mh(t) + \frac{1}{m}(1 - h(t)) \right\} \mathrm{d}t. \tag{20}$$

Similarly, let $\varepsilon > 0$ and note that $1 + \varepsilon(m-1)/m \leq m$. We have that $mh(t) + m^{-1}(1 - h(t)) \geq 1 + \varepsilon(m-1)/m$ if and only if $h \geq (1+\varepsilon)/(m+1)$. Therefore, we estimate in turn

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\{h(t)\geq(m+1)^{-1}\}}\left\{mh(t)+\frac{1}{m}(1-h(t))\right\}\mathrm{d}t\\
&\leq\left(1+\varepsilon\frac{m-1}{m}\right)\left|\left\{\frac{1}{m+1}\leq h\leq\frac{1+\varepsilon}{m+1}\right\}\right|+m\left(2\pi-\left|\left\{h\leq\frac{1+\varepsilon}{m+1}\right\}\right|\right)\\
&=4\left(1+\varepsilon\frac{m-1}{m}\right)\left(\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{m+1}}-\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1}{m+1}}\right)\\
&\qquad\qquad+m\left(2\pi-4\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{m+1}}\right)\\
&=2\pi m-4\left(1+\varepsilon\frac{m-1}{m}\right)\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1}{m+1}}\\
&\qquad\qquad-4(m-1)\left(1-\frac{\varepsilon}{m}\right)\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{m+1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$f(x,1)\leq 2\pi m-4\varepsilon\frac{m-1}{m}\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1}{m+1}}-4(m-1)\left(1-\frac{\varepsilon}{m}\right)\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{m+1}},$$

and it suffices to check that there exist $\varepsilon>0$ and $m_0>1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2\pi}&\left(2\pi m-4\varepsilon\frac{m-1}{m}\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1}{m+1}}-4(m-1)\left(1-\frac{\varepsilon}{m}\right)\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{m+1}}\right)\\
&\qquad\qquad\leq\frac{2}{1+m^{-1}},
\end{aligned}$$

for all $1<m\leq m_0$. Upon factorization, the above is equivalent to:

$$\frac{m(m-1)}{m+1}\leq(m-1)\left[\frac{2\varepsilon}{\pi m}\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1}{m+1}}-\left(1-\frac{\varepsilon}{m}\right)\frac{2}{\pi}\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{m+1}}\right].\tag{21}$$

Therefore, if $\tau=0$, we have $m=1$ and (21) holds with no restriction on M. If $\tau>0$ we have $m-1>0$ and (21) is verified if and only if

$$\frac{m}{m+1}\leq\frac{2}{\pi}\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{m+1}}-\frac{2\varepsilon}{\pi m}\left(\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{m+1}}-\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1}{m+1}}\right).\tag{22}$$

Let $\delta=m-1>0$ and consider the function ζ defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\zeta(\varepsilon,\delta)=\\
&=\frac{2}{\pi}\left[\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{2+\delta}}-\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\delta}\left(\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{2+\delta}}-\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1}{2+\delta}}\right)\right]-\frac{1+\delta}{2+\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then (22) is equivalent to $\zeta(\varepsilon,\delta)\geq 0$. We note that $\zeta(0,0)=\frac{2}{\pi}\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}-\frac{1}{2}=0$. By Taylor's expansion, there exists $\varepsilon_0>0$ such that the strict inequality

$\zeta(\varepsilon_0, 0) > 0$ is satisfied. Hence, by continuity, there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that $\zeta(\varepsilon_0, \delta) > 0$ for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$. Setting $m_0 = 1 + \delta_0$, we conclude that (22) is satisfied for $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0$ and for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$. It follows that the statement of the lemma holds with $M_0 = m_0^{1/\tau}$. □

Proof of Proposition 1. In view of Lemma 6 we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta(A_\tau) = &\left(\sup_{x\in\Omega, 0<\rho<d_x} \frac{f(x,\rho)}{4\pi^{-1}\arctan M^{-(1-\tau)/2}}\right)^{-1} \\ =&\frac{2}{\pi}(1+M^{-\tau})\arctan M^{-(1-\tau)/2}.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by direct check we see that w_τ is a 2π-periodic weak solution to the equation

$$-(k_{\tau,2}w_\tau')' = \frac{\mu}{c}k_{\tau,1}w_\tau \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R},$$

where $k_{\tau,1}$, $k_{\tau,2}$ are the diagonal entries of K_τ. It follows by Lemma 3 that u_τ satisfies (1) with $A = A_\tau$. Since w_τ is absolutely continuous, u_τ is Hölder continuous with exponent $\beta(A_\tau)$. □

Proof of Theorem 2. The proof is a direct consequence of Proposition 1. □

References

[1] E. De Giorgi, Sulla differenziabilità e l'analiticità delle estremali degli integrali multipli regolari, Mem. Acc. Sci. Torino Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Nat. (3) **3** (1957), 25–43.

[2] R. Giova, A weighted Wirtinger inequality, to appear on Ricerche Mat.

[3] T. Iwaniec and C. Sbordone, Quasiharmonic fields, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **18** No. 5 (2001), 519–572.

[4] C.B. Morrey, On the solutions of quasi-linear elliptic partial differential equations, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **43** No. 1 (1938), 126–166.

[5] J. Nash, Continuity of solutions of parabolic and elliptic equations, Amer. J. Math. **80** No. 5 (1958), 931–954.

[6] L.C. Piccinini and S. Spagnolo, On the Hölder continuity of solutions of second order elliptic equations in two variables, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa **26** No. 2 (1972), 391–402.

[7] T. Ricciardi, A sharp Hölder estimate for elliptic equations in two variables, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh **135A** (2005), 165–173.

[8] T. Ricciardi, A sharp weighted Wirtinger inequality, Boll. U.M.I. (8) **8-B** (2005), 259–267.